

**REMARKS**

Applicant hereby responds to the office action dated October 22, 2002. In response to the objections to claims 8, 19, 30 and 41 noted in paragraph 2 of the Examiner's action, Applicant notes that the referenced claims have been canceled. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

In response to item no. 3 in the action, the undersigned notes that the files that were transferred to the undersigned from Applicant's former counsel including this application file were incomplete and in disarray. None of the references cited in the various information disclosure statements of this application were included. Furthermore, although there is an indication in the file that the referenced information disclosure statement was filed as stated, there is no copy of the referenced information disclosure statement. Accordingly, it is impossible to compare references from the file with the other information disclosure statements in order to determine what references were to have been submitted by the referenced IDS. The undersigned will review other copending applications and further discuss the matter with the inventor in order to determine whether any additional submissions should be made.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the prior art rejections set forth by the Examiner under 35 USC sections 102 and 103. Applicant submits that the references of record whether considered alone or in combination fail to either teach or suggest Applicant's presently claimed invention.

By this amendment, Applicant has modified each of the independent claims to further require that the claimed polyhedron has both internal and external plane surfaces which are used to display information. Applicant submits that the prior art references of record at best teach polyhedron structures wherein only external surfaces of the polyhedron contain information. There is simply no teaching or suggestion whatsoever concerning the use of both internal and external surfaces for the display of information.

As described in the instant application, the use of both internal and external surfaces of the polyhedron advantageously provides a readily identified display in which additional information may be inherently and intuitively easily displayed. For example, see claims 8 and 33 which describe the advantageous presentation of information that is preferred and not preferred on the various surfaces. The references of record similarly fail to teach or suggest this advance in the art.

Appl. No. 09/664,843  
Amdt. Dated January 22, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of October 22, 2002

In light of the foregoing Applicant submits that all claims now stand in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 22, 2004

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Robert J. Depke  
**HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLC**  
131 S. Dearborn, 30<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60603  
Tel: (312) 263-3600  
**Attorney for Applicant**

(Reg. #37,607)

Appl. No. 09/664,843  
Amdt. Dated January 22, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of October 22, 2002

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States  
Postal Service as First Class Mail on January 22, 2004 2004 in an envelope addressed to:

**Mail Stop Petition  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450**



Attorney for Applicants